

Wu, Jennifer

From: Wu, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 12:05 PM
To: SEEDS Joshua; jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov; Henning, Alan; Palmer, John; Labiosa, Rochelle
Cc: Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal; FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

Yes, thanks Josh.

From: SEEDS Joshua [<mailto:SEEDS.Joshua@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Wu, Jennifer; jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov; Henning, Alan; Palmer, John; Labiosa, Rochelle
Cc: Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal; FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

I suggest dropping “sufficiency” from the first sentence. It might confuse folks. “EPA supports the preliminary results of the **sufficiency** analysis **showing** that greater riparian buffers are needed for small and medium fish-bearing streams.”

Thanks!
Josh

From: Wu, Jennifer [<mailto:Wu.Jennifer@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 9:08 AM
To: SEEDS Joshua; jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov; Henning, Alan; Palmer, John; Labiosa, Rochelle
Cc: Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal; SEEDS Joshua; FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

Forgot to attach the latest...

From: Wu, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 9:07 AM
To: 'SEEDS Joshua'; jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov; Henning, Alan; Palmer, John; Labiosa, Rochelle
Cc: Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal; SEEDS Joshua; FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

Thanks for the comments. I made a couple of other small changes. John, take a look at this, and let's talk later with Alan and Rochelle.

I'll also work with Alan to get our group together again, if needed, so we can go over any last details. - Jenny

From: SEEDS Joshua [<mailto:SEEDS.Joshua@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 4:09 PM
To: jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov; Wu, Jennifer; Henning, Alan; Palmer, John
Cc: Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal; SEEDS Joshua; FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

I found a couple typos as well and made a couple minor changes. This looks really good. Thanks.

Josh

From: Jeffrey Lockwood - NOAA Federal [<mailto:jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 12:14 PM
To: Jennifer Wu; Alan Henning; Palmer, John
Cc: SEEDS Joshua; Ken Phippen - NOAA Federal
Subject: EPA's talking points for EQC and Board of Forestry Meetings

I like what you've done in the EPA talking points. I found two typos that you might want to fix so when you're reading you don't stumble when you run across the error (see attached Track Changes version).

I'll probably just say that I concur with what you've said about how and why the PCW criterion was added, then go over how we consulted on the Oregon standard and are now re-doing it due to the litigation. And how we're going to still need PCW.

One thing about the history section (1.c.), the work on ODF riparian rules goes back farther than the IMST and sufficiency analysis, back to when the Oregon Coastal Salmon Restoration Initiative was being developed in 1997 and as it evolved into the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. The state set and NMFS had an MOA that led to a committee to look at riparian rules and certain other aspects, see:

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=odf%20moa%20committee>

There was not final agreement on rule changes at that time but the issue of riparian buffers and threatened coho salmon was put on the radar for the first time.

One other thing, I'm not planning on going to the EQC meeting unless someone can convince me it's absolutely necessary. I can't justify the time out of the office. We could consider sending in a short letter of support if that would be useful.

Thanks,

Jeff Lockwood

503-231-2249